

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figure 3. The attached "Replacement Sheet," which includes Figure 3, replaces the original sheet including Figure 3.

Please amend Figure 3 to correct the flow chart at step S130.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-14 and 17-22 remain pending in the present application. Claims 3 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 9 have been amended. Claims 17-22 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ophir, et al. in view of Lake, et al. Claim 3 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 3 depended from Claim 2 which depended from Claim 1 which depended from Claim 16. Applicant reviewed the limitations of Claims 2 and 3 and Applicant believes that only the limitations of Claims 3, 1 and 16 are necessary for distinguishing over the art of record.

Claim 1 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claim 3 and 16 and Claims 3 and 16 have been cancelled. Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claim 14, which depends from Claim 1, is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 3-13 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 3 has been incorporated into Claim 1 along with Claim 16 as detailed above.

Claim 4 has been amended to depend from Claim 2. Claims 5, 10 and 11 ultimately depend from Claim 4.

Claim 6 has been amended to depend from Claim 2. Claims 7, 8, 12 and 13 ultimately depend from Claim 6.

Claim 9 has been amended to depend from Claim 2.

DRAWINGS

During preparation of the Amendment, Applicant noticed a drawing mistake in Figure 3. Figure 3 has been amended to correct this mistake. Support for this Amendment is given in the original specification on page 11, lines 15-19.

NEW CLAIMS

Claim 17 is a dependent claim which Applicant believes properly further limits Claim 9.

Claims 18-21 are dependent claims which Applicant believes properly further limits Claim 1.

Claim 22 is a dependent claim which Applicant believes properly further limits Claim 21.

Applicant believes new Claims 17-22 read on the elected invention.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 8, 2006

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg